

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24 and 28-31 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-31 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-6, 14-19, 21-26 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,603,488 to Humpleman et al. (hereinafter "Humpleman") in view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 5,796,404 to Gentner ("Gentner"). Claims 7-13, 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. in view of Gentner and further in view of Japanese unexamined Patent Application Publication No. 1-100620 to Higuchi ("Higuchi").

Applicants amend independent claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, and 28-31 herewith to recite more clearly the claimed subject matter. The claims amendments are supported by the originally filed specification and claims for example, FIGS. 6-11 and the corresponding description from page 16, line 7 through page 21, line 16.

In the Amendment filed on April 5, 2006, the claims were amended and patentability arguments were presented. Relative to independent claim 1, we argued that "characteristic menu information [...] configured to be composed of key codes serving as commands in applications" is not taught by the cited prior art reference, Humpleman. The outstanding Office Action concedes that Humpleman does not teach this feature, but relies on the newly cited Gentner reference to cure the deficiency. Gentner (see Abstract, FIG. 3, and paragraph starting in col. 5, line 66) illustrates and describes alphanumeric characters superimposed on the graphical objects in a menu. When the corresponding keyboard alphanumeric character is depressed, an associated operation is launched.

The alphanumeric characters superimposed on graphic objects are not the same as "key codes serving as commands in applications," because the alphanumeric keys disclosed in Gunter merely provide an alternative manner of selecting items in the menu and are not linked to commands. Higuchi does not correct or compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Humpleman and Gentner in disclosing all¹ the features recited in claim 1.

¹ See MPEP 2142 stating, as one of the three "basic criteria [that] must be met" in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations," (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the revised claims 1-31 are patentable over the cited prior art and request reconsideration.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct. 30, 2006

By: L.Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501